

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 15, 20, and 25 are amended.

New claims 33-40 are added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 14-18 and 20-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kauhaniemi et al. (US Patent pub. No. 2004/0266496, hereinafter “Kauhaniemi”). in view of Wilson (U.S. No. 2003/0114184, hereinafter “Wilson”).

Regarding the amended claim 14, neither Kauhaniemi nor Wilson, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable a sheet shaped member covering the bendable member and the two housing portions. Support for the amendment is found in the paragraph [0093] of the specification. Kauhaniemi does not disclose any sheet shaped member covering the flexible structure 1 and the two main parts 11, 12. Also, Wilson does not disclose any sheet shaped member covering the resilient elongate flexible strap 30 and the housing portions 2, 3 and 4. Accordingly, the combination of Kauhaniemi and Wilson does not meet all of the limitations of claim 14. Therefore, the asserted combination of Kauhaniemi and Wilson does not render claim 14 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 14 is respectfully requested.

Claims 16, 21, 27, 28, and 29 which are directly or indirectly dependent from any one of claim 14 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 14.

Regarding the amended claim 15, neither Kauhaniemi nor Wilson, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that the joint member covers the bendable member and the two housing portions. Support for the amendment is found in the paragraph [0093] of the specification. Kauhaniemi does not disclose that the joint member covers the flexible structure 1 and the two main parts 11, 12. The Office action states that Kauhaniemi discloses element 13 as the joint member. However, there is no disclosure in Kauhaniemi that the element 13 covers the flexible structure 1 and the two main parts 11, 12. Also, Wilson does not disclose any joint member that covers the resilient elongate flexible strap 30 and the housing portions 2, 3 and 4. Accordingly, the combination of Kauhaniemi and Wilson does not meet all of the limitations of claim 15. Therefore, the asserted combination of Kauhaniemi and Wilson does not render claim 15 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 17, 18, and 30 which are dependent from any one of claim 15 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 15.

Regarding the amended claim 20, neither Kauhaniemi nor Wilson, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that the connecting portion covers the flexible wiring member and the receiving antenna. Support for the amendment is found in the paragraph [0134] of the specification. Kauhaniemi does not disclose any flexible wiring member and receiving antenna that is covered by the hinge structure 13. The Office action states that Kauhaniemi discloses the flexible wiring member in paragraphs 0043-0044 and Figure 14.

However, there is no disclosure in Kauhaniemi that the hinge structure 13 covers the wire structure 1 shown in Figure 14. The Office action states that the receiving antenna is inherent with respect to the mobile phone. However, covering the receiving antenna by the connecting portion is not inherent. Also, Wilson does not disclose that the resilient elongate flexible strap 30 covers any flexible wiring member and receiving antenna. Accordingly, the combination of Kauhaniemi and Wilson does not meet all of the limitations of claim 20. Therefore, the asserted combination of Kauhaniemi and Wilson does not render claim 20 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 20 is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-24 and 31 which are dependent from any one of claim 20 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 20.

Regarding the amended claim 25, neither Kauhaniemi nor Wilson, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable a cover which covers the upper housing, the lower housing, and the connecting portion. Kauhaniemi does not disclose any cover that covers the two main parts 11, 12 and the hinge structure 13. Also, Wilson does not disclose any cover that covers the upper housing 4, the lower housings 2 and 3, and the resilient elongate flexible strap 30. Accordingly, the combination of Kauhaniemi and Wilson does not meet all of the limitations of claim 25. Therefore, the asserted combination of Kauhaniemi and Wilson does not render claim 25 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 25 is respectfully requested.

Claims 26 and 32 which are dependent from claim 25 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 25.

Appl. No. 10/576,630
Amdt. Dated: November 16, 2009
Reply to Office action of August 17, 2009

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-40271.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: November 16, 2009